REMARKS

In this reply, claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain present in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McWalter et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0179233) in view of Mocek et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182099). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. for the reasons stated below.

McWalter et al. discloses a user interface manager for abstracting a user interface in which a request is received from an application program to present data to a user. The user interface manager in McWalter et al. determines which user interface devices are currently available and selects a particular user interface device to present the data. Abstract controls for the selected user interface device that have been provided to the application program are then used to present the data to the user via the selected user interface device. McWalter et al. also discloses carlets that are involved to manage operations (see paragraph 0036) and metacarlets that transfer and receive information (see paragraph 0042).

Mocek et al. discloses a system for emulating a telematics client. The Mocek et al. system includes a software stack including a service gateway for loading an emulator, and a user interface manager configured to communicate with the loaded emulator. The user interface manager enables a presentation of a Telematics Control Unit (TCU) user interface without accessing the TCU.

In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, as amended, is directed to a system for providing vehicle context information for onboard vehicle devices. The system includes a monitor for monitoring a plurality of onboard vehicle devices and acquiring data. The system also includes an identifier for identifying context information for the data related to each of the plurality of monitored onboard vehicle devices, and a data

storage device having memory for storing vehicle context information for the plurality of onboard vehicle devices. The system further includes an application programming interface for communicating the data storage device with a requesting device onboard the vehicle. The application programming interface downloads the vehicle context information to the requesting device.

Claim 12, as amended, is directed to a method of providing vehicle context information for use with onboard vehicle devices. The method includes the steps of sensing the presence of each of a plurality of onboard vehicle devices, and identifying vehicle context information for data related to each of the plurality of onboard vehicle devices. The method also includes the steps of storing in memory the vehicle context information available from each of the plurality of onboard vehicle devices, and communicating with an onboard requesting vehicle device. The method further includes the step of downloading at least some of the stored vehicle context information to the requesting vehicle device.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, in the references themselves or in the general knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. In addition, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Nowhere do either of the McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. patent publications teach or even suggest a system or method for providing vehicle context information for onboard vehicle devices that includes a monitor for acquiring data and an identifier for identifying context information for the data related to each of a plurality of monitored onboard vehicle devices in combination with a data storage device and application programming interface as recited in claim 1, as amended. Nor do either of the references to McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. teach or suggest a method of providing vehicle context information which includes the steps of sensing the presence of each of a plurality of onboard vehicle devices, identifying vehicle context information for data related to each of the devices, storing the vehicle context

information in memory, communicating and downloading stored vehicle context information to a requesting vehicle device, as recited in method claim 12, as amended.

Instead, the McWalter et al. system receives the request from an application program to present data to a user and determines which user interface devices are currently available, and then selects a particular user interface device to present the data. The Examiner has acknowledged that McWalter et al. does not explicitly teach identifying context information related to each vehicle devices, storing the vehicle context information for the vehicle devices, and downloading the vehicle context information to the requesting device. The Examiner has taken the position that McWalter et al. obviously includes teaching the capability of identifying the context information related to each device in order to be able to provide specific data the TCU wants to present, and downloading the data to the output device. Applicants submit that the mere possibility that a reference allegedly teaches the capability of identifying context information does not render the claims obvious. This alleged teaching of a mere capability does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations of independent claims 1 and 12.

Applicants request that the Examiner specifically point out any teaching, suggestion, or motivation in either of the McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. patent publications necessary to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Absent any such teaching, suggestion, or motivation, the claims would not have been rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the combination of McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-19 is respectfully requested.

The remaining claim, claim 6, is not rejected. Applicants assume that claim 6 defines allowable subject matter, however, the Examiner has not indicated any such allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically address the examination of claim 6.

Applicants submit that the McWalter et al. and Mocek et al. patent publications either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants are of the position that claims 1-5 and 7-19, as well as claim 6, should be allowable over the cited references.

Applicants reserve the right to file a declaration (or affidavit) under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 to antedate the McWalter et al. and the Mocek et al. patent publications and thereby remove both publications as references. However, Applicants believe that pending claims 1-19 define allowable subject matter in view of the cited references and should be allowed, absent the filing of any such declaration.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. The Examiner's allowance of the present application is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding patentability of any of the claims, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG JOHN SIMONDS ET AL.

By: Price, Heneveld, Cooper,
DeWitt & Litton, LLP

December 9, 2004
Date

Kevin T. Grzelak
Registration No. 35 169
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

KTG/jrb